

REMARKS

Independent Claims 36, 39, and 42 are now pending in the application. Claims 35, 37, 38, 40, 41, and 43 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein, and Claims 36, 39, and 42 have been amended herein.

In view of the amendments above and the remarks below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Applicants are filing herewith two copies of a Substitute Specification, one copy in marked-up form showing the changes from the previous version, and one copy in clean form as amended. The amendments presented in the Substitute Specification address minor grammatical, typographical, and idiomatic informalities, and update continuing application data. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added.

The Abstract of the disclosure was objected to as not being descriptive of the claimed invention. Applicants have replaced the Abstract herein with a new Abstract reflecting the claimed invention as amended herein. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the abstract is respectfully requested.

Claims 35, 37, 38, 40, 41, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 5,812,278 (Toyoda et al.). Claims 36, 39, and 42 were objected to as dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were deemed allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Without conceding the propriety of the rejection and objection, Applicants have cancelled the rejected claims without prejudice or disclaimer of their subject matter, and without prejudice to claiming the same or similar subject matter in a later stage of prosecution in this or a divisional application. Applicants have rewritten independent Claims 36, 39, and 42 in independent form to include the features recited in their respective base claims. Applicants submit that these claims are now in condition for allowance.

In rewriting these claims, Applicants have not adopted the recommendation to change certain claim language used in base Claims 35 and 41. Specifically, the Examiner recommended changing the terminology “low quality image data” used in Claim 35 at line 5, Claim 38 at line 5, and Claim 41 at line 6, to --low quality printing control processing--, to correspond to Figure 9, Step S20-7.

Applicants submit, however, that the requesting step of Claims 36 and 42, and the request unit of Claim 39, correspond to Step 20-11 in Figure 9. As stated at page 19, lines 7-9 of the specification as originally filed (page 13, lines 1-5 of marked-up copy of substitute specification) if the image quality is determined to be low-quality, the flow advances to Step S20-11 to request a low quality image. Thus, with the claimed invention, a printing apparatus requests a low quality image data of an image to be printed in accordance with a result of a comparison of the resolution of the image to be printed with the capability of the printer.

Applicants thus submit that independent Claims 36, 39, and 42 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application are respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C., office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address below.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne M. Maher

Attorney for Applicants
Anne M. Maher
Registration No. 38,231

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

DC_MAIN 180603v1